

Customer No. 24498
Ser. No. 10/563,892
Reply to Office action of September 5, 2008

PU030213

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERRemarks/Arguments

NOV 12 2008

Claims 1 – 20 are pending and claims 1 – 20 are rejected. In this response claims 1, 8 and 14 are amended.

35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5 -8, 12 – 14 and 18 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiroi, U.S. Patent No. 6,204,887. Hiroi discloses to assess the demand for system responses to process multiple images in a single display screen and to resize one or more of the displayed windows in order to preclude exceeding the available system resources. Please see column 6 lines 52 – 57, for example,

"FIGS. 2A – 2C illustrate various embodiments of the present invention, wherein the window size of one or more windows being displayed at the same time is adjusted so that the demand for system resources ... will not exceed the available resources."

Contrary to the disclosure of Hiroi, the present application recites, as in claim 1,

"apply the embedded picture setting data to the entire displayed screen if the system is not in the OSD mode"

Whereas Hiroi alters each window separately under certain conditions, the present application either applies embedded picture setting data to the entire displayed screen or withholds embedded picture setting data from the entire displayed screen. Support for the amendment of claim 1 is found in the specification text on page 4 lines 17 – 20

"If the video system 10 is not currently in an On Screen Display or other Graphic Centric Mode, ... the embedded picture data alone is used to select the screen format and an associated color conversion matrix."

and in Fig. 1 where it is graphically indicated that the color conversion

Customer No. 24498
Ser. No. 10/563,892
Reply to Office action of September 5, 2008

PU030213

and display format are set for the image being displayed after the OSD signal is combined with the input video signal. With the amendment of claim 1, the rejection is traversed.

Claims 8 and 14 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendment of claim 1 and thus are believed allowable for all the reasons enumerated above. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of 1, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Claims 2 – 7, 9 – 13 and 15 – 20, being properly drawn to independent claims believed to be allowable are also allowable. Withdrawal of rejections of dependent claims 2 – 7, 9 – 13 and 15 – 20 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 – 4, 9 – 11 and 15 – 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Hiroi with consideration of Glen et al. (US 6,462,786). Claims 2 – 4, 9 – 11 and 15 – 17, being properly drawn to independent claims believed to be allowable are also allowable. Withdrawal of rejections of dependent claims 2 – 4, 9 – 11 and 15 – 17 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's objections and rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (386) 438-8034, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Customer No. 24498
Ser. No. 10/563,892
Reply to Office action of September 5, 2008

PU030213

Respectfully submitted,
Janghwan Lee et.al.



By: Robert D. Shedd
Reg. No. 36,269
Phone (609) 734-6828

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
November 10, 2008